

REPORT RESUMES

ED 003 422

24

CONFERENCE ON COORDINATION OF ACCEPTED PROPOSALS FOR THE
COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROGRAM IN FIRST GRADE READING
INSTRUCTION. FINAL REPORT.

BY- BOND, GUY L. DYKSTRA, ROBERT
MINNESOTA UNIV., MINNEAPOLIS

REPORT NUMBER CRP-F-062

PUB DATE

64

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.09 HC-\$0.52 13P.

DESCRIPTORS- *CONFERENCES, COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS, *RESEARCH
COMMITTEES, *READING INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH PROBLEMS, *READING
RESEARCH, RESEARCH PROJECTS, RESEARCH METHODOLOGY, GRADE 1,
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

A 1964 SUMMER CONFERENCE WAS HELD TO INFORM PROJECT
DIRECTORS OF INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH CENTERS ABOUT INDEPENDENT
RESEARCH PROJECTS IN FIRST-GRADE READING INSTRUCTION. IT WAS
DESIGNED TO PRODUCE AWARENESS OF THE PROJECTS, TO GAIN
AGREEMENT AND UNIFORMITY IN RESEARCH EFFORTS, TO APPRAISE
RESEARCH DESIGNS, AND TO EXPLORE FURTHER PARTICIPATION IN
COORDINATION OF ACTIVITY. COMMITTEES WERE ESTABLISHED TO
PREPARE AND SUBMIT RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING COMMON
PROCEDURES, DATA RECORDING TECHNIQUES, AND OTHER AREAS OF
INTEREST. AGREEMENT WAS REACHED ON THE NEED FOR COMMON
MEASURES AND PROCEDURES, AND FOR A COORDINATING CENTER. (RS)

ED003422

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the
person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions
stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education
position or policy.

FINAL REPORT

CONFERENCE ON COORDINATION OF ACCEPTED PROPOSALS FOR THE COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROGRAM IN FIRST GRADE READING INSTRUCTION

Cooperative Research Project No. F-062

Guy L. Bond
Robert Dykstra

University of Minnesota

1964

The research reported herein was supported by the
Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education,
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ED003422

I. Abstract

The "Conference on Coordination of Accepted Proposals for the Cooperative Research Program in First Grade Reading Instruction", supported by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was held at the Continuation Center on the University of Minnesota Campus the dates of May 31 through June 3, 1964. In attendance were the Project Directors of the individual research centers which had been accepted to become part of the U.S. Office of Education's Cooperative Research Program in First Grade Reading Instruction.

The conference was designed with the following objectives in mind:

1. To allow the various project directors to become informed about each of the independent projects and their unique characteristics.
2. To gain agreement among the individual research directors concerning possible uniformity of research design, statistical analysis, and data to be collected.
3. To design common data sheets and card-punching procedures wherever feasible to be used by the individual projects, thus expediting analysis of the combined data in the coordinating center.
4. To appraise research designs and statistical treatments of individual investigations and to suggest any feasible modifications which would increase the usefulness of the data as part of the coordinated research while maintaining the unique contributions of the individual investigations.
5. To explore the possibility of the individual directors' participating in area conferences in conjunction with regularly scheduled regional educational meetings.

II. Organization of the Conference

The conference began with a 6:30 dinner meeting at the Continuation Center on Sunday, May 31, 1964. Dean Robert J. Keller of the College of Education, University of Minnesota welcomed the group. Working plans for the conference were outlined and accepted.

A. Conference Personnel

The conference was planned and organized by Chairman Guy L. Bond and Co-Chairman, Robert Dykstra. Participants included Project Directors, Consultants, and Recorders.

1. Project Directors in Attendance

Nita M. Wyatt, University of Kansas
George D. Spache, University of Florida
Robert B. Riddell, University of California
Hale C. Reid, Cedar Rapids, Iowa Public Schools
William D. Sheldon, Syracuse University
Russell G. Stauffer, University of Delaware
J. Wesley Schneyer, University of Pennsylvania
Helen A. Murphy, Boston University
Doris U. Spencer, Johnson State College (Vermont)
Albert J. Harris, City University of New York
Albert J. Mazurkiewicz, Lehigh University
Roy McCanne, Consultant, Colorado State Department of Education
Jeanne S. Chall, City College of City University of New York
Donald L. Cleland, University of Pittsburgh
Harold J. Tanyzer, Hofstra University
Elizabeth Anne Bordeaux, Goldsboro, North Carolina City Schools
Arthur W. Heilman, Pennsylvania State University
Katherine A. Morrill, Moses Y. Leach School, Wallingford, Conn.
Olive S. Miles, Springfield, Massachusetts Public Schools
Harry T. Hahn, Oakland Schools, Pontiac, Michigan
Sister M. Marita, Marquette University
Edward Fry, Rutgers - The State University
Robert B. Hayes, Department of Public Instruction, Harrisburg, Pa.
James B. Macdonald, University of Wisconsin
John C. Manning, Fresno State College
Thomas D. Horn, University of Texas
William M. Kendrick, San Diego County Department of Education
Hazen G. Curtis, Florida State University
Paul H. Jacobs, Florida State Department of Education

2. Consultants

Donald D. Durrell, Boston University
Bruce Balow, University of Minnesota
Cyril J. Hoyt, University of Minnesota
Bjorn Karlsen, University of Minnesota
Donald MacEachern, University of Minnesota
Theodore Clymer, University of Minnesota
Carlton Singleton, Wesleyan University
Lawrence Liddiard, University of Minnesota

3. Recorders

Naomi Chase, University of Minnesota
Norine Odland, University of Minnesota
Patricia Lane, University of Minnesota
Bette Peltola, University of Minnesota

B. Conference Agenda

The agenda for the conference was as follows:

Sunday, May 31

6:30 P.M. --- General planning session, introduction of conference participants, and greetings from Dean Robert J. Keller.

Monday, June 1

8:30 A.M. --- General session with Dr. Doris Gunderson of the U.S. Office of Education for the purpose of negotiating contracts.

9:30 A.M. --- Committee meetings involving directors of related projects.

12:00 P.M. --- Luncheon - Discussion of role of the Coordinating Center.

1:00 P.M. --- Committee meetings involving following committees:

- (1) Control Variables
(Age, sex, IQ, readiness, socio-economic status, educational experiences, pre-instructional reading ability, etc.)
- (2) Outcome Variables
(Reading achievement tests, attitudes, books read, accuracy and speed of oral reading, sight vocabulary, knowledge of phonetic, structural, and sight elements, spelling ability, writing ability, etc.)
- (3) Environmental Variables
(Relevant characteristics of the teacher, the classroom, the school, the community, etc.)
- (4) Statistical Treatment and Data Tabulation
(Consideration of possible common methods of recording and processing data to facilitate coordination of individual projects)

6:00 P.M. --- Dinner and exchange of ideas

Tuesday, June 2

9:00 A.M. --- General session with Mr. Larry Liddiard of the University of Minnesota's Numerical Analysis Center

10:00 A.M. --- Committee meetings

12:00 P.M. --- Luncheon

1:00 P.M. --- Presentation and discussion of tentative reports by committee in preparation for writing of final reports

6:00 P.M. --- Dinner meeting followed by writing of final committee reports.

Wednesday, June 3

9:00 A.M. --- Presentation and discussion of final committee reports.

12:00 P.M. --- Dismissal

III. Committee Recommendations

Each of the committees submitted for approval recommendations concerning common procedures, common data recording techniques, and the like. The following recommendations were given approval by the conference participants:

A. General Recommendations

In addition to the specific recommendations concerning common measures and procedures which are outlined in the sections of this report which follow, the conference participants made the following general recommendations:

1. The collection of common data under common procedures is essential to the success of the cooperative aspects of the research program.
2. A Coordinating Center should be established.
3. Another meeting of project directors should be scheduled for December.
4. There should be continuing communication among project centers and between project centers and the Coordinating Center. Directors of projects in the same area of the country should arrange to meet with each other.
5. As suggested by Dr. Gunderson, all unstandardized tests, rating scales, and personality or attitude questionnaires should be cleared with the U.S. Office of Education.

B. Recommendations Concerning Initial Measures

It was unanimously agreed that the following initial tests be administered as common measures:

1. Durrell-Murphy Word Elements Tests
 - a. Identification of phonemes (auditory discrimination); Raw score equals rights minus wrongs
 - b. Letter names-number of capitals right, number of lower case right
 - c. Learning rate test -- number of words learned

2. Visual Discrimination (Thurstone Tests)
 - a. Pattern copying - total number right
 - b. Identical forms - total number right
3. Metropolitan Readiness
 - a. Word meaning - (auditory vocabulary) - number right
 - b. Listening - number right
4. Pintner-Cunningham Primary Mental Test, Form B - translate raw score into M.A.
5. Detroit Word Recognition Test (to be administered to those entering first-grade children who have been identified by the teacher as possessing some measure of reading ability) -- Raw score should be reported.

C. Recommendations Concerning Pupil Characteristics

The following information should be reported:

1. Chronological age as of October 1st -- repeaters should be noted as well as the per cent of repeaters in the population.
2. Sex
3. Race and/or ethnic groups -- Mexican, Puerto Rican, etc.
4. Pre-school experience -- Nursery school, kindergarten, daily vacation Bible school, other.

D. Recommendations Concerning Teacher Characteristics

It was agreed that knowledge of certain teacher characteristics would be helpful:

1. Sex
2. Age
3. Degrees held and type of certification
4. Experience in terms of total years and years in first-grade classrooms
5. Marital status
6. Number of children
7. Attitude as measured by the San Diego Attitude Inventory for Teachers.

The Committee considering the area of teacher characteristics also called attention to other measures which might be used by some of the projects:

1. The "Durrell Services to Pupils"
2. Reid Teacher Rating Scale
3. Mitzel-Medley OSCAR (Classroom climate)
4. Flanders-Amidon

E. Recommendations Concerning Characteristics of the Class, School, and Community

The conference participants agreed that the following information should be gathered by each project:

1. Average class size and range of class size for each treatment group.
2. Grouping method employed in formation of first-grade classes (homogeneous, heterogeneous, or describe)
3. A descriptive statement of local regulations regarding school entrance age.
4. Length of official school day.
5. Length of official school year.
6. School size -- number of first-grade classes and combination classes.
7. District size and nature
8. Library information -- librarian services, size, traveling or central, etc.
9. Socio-economic status of community as derived from census reports.
10. Organization (urban, suburban, small town, rural).
11. Occupational characteristics of community (industrial, agrarian, etc.)
12. General statement concerning "condition" of community (stable, transitional, "blighted", etc.)

F. Recommendations Concerning Outcome Variables

A number of common post-instruction measures were adopted for use by all projects:

1. Stanford Achievement Test, Primary Battery, Form I. This test will give measures of:
 - a. General reading achievement
 - b. Knowledge of phonic elements and ability to apply such knowledge in identifying words
 - c. Literal comprehension and interpretation of continuous material
 - d. Spelling ability
 - e. A measure of vocabulary not based on reading

The group further recommended that if a class averaged 3.5 or higher on the Stanford Primary I, that class should be administered Stanford Primary II. For both, subtest scores in addition to overall scores should be reported.

2. The Gilmore Oral Reading Test should be administered in the following manner:
 - a. Use standardized instructions; give two comprehension questions, but disregard scoring of comprehension.
 - b. Score is 10 minus errors; use Gilmore grade scores for accuracy and rate. Hesitations and repetitions are not to be counted as errors.
 - c. A sample of 30 to 50 students, selected from each treatment group in a random manner will be administered this test.
 - d. The test is to be given by a member of the research staff.
3. Gates Word Pronunciation Test from the Gates Diagnostic
 - a. Use first column only
 - b. Administer and score according to directions
 - c. Test same students as those randomly selected for the Gilmore Oral Reading Test
 - d. Test should be administered by the same person who gives the oral reading test with the recommendation that this test precede the Gilmore.
4. Test of Regularly Spelled Words from Phonic Systems to be constructed by Dr. Bjorn Karlsen
 - a. Administration and scoring of tests should follow pattern of that prescribed for the Gates Word Pronunciation in (3) above.
5. San Diego Attitude Inventory will be made available to all projects.

In addition to the recommendations listed above, the committee on outcome variables suggested that a 15 minute writing sample for a picture stimulus be obtained from each pupil. It was further suggested that the writings of the random sample selected for the oral reading test be analyzed for such elements as total number of words, average sentence length, and some measure of word difficulty or word length. There was a lack of agreement on whether all research projects would use this procedure. A group of persons interested in the problem agreed to explore possibilities and report at the December meeting (if not earlier).

G. Recommendations Concerning Experimental Procedures

Certain procedural controls were deemed essential by the group.

1. Tests should not be in the hands of the teacher until the close of the school day preceding the day the test is to be given.
2. Test scoring should be done by the research staff, not the classroom teacher.
3. The experimental period will be 140 days. Pretests and post-tests which might conceivably interfere with the experimentation should be given before or after this 140 day period.
4. Attendance should be reported as total days present in each quarter of the experimental period. No recommendation was made concerning the maximum number of days a child could be absent and still remain in the study. This should be an individual decision of each project. Material sent to the Coordinating Center should include data on all children with a note of the absences.
5. The amount of time spent in reading instruction and in supportive activities should be reported. It was agreed that each project director would compile a report on the time given to the experimental instruction and supportive activities. These reports would be sent to Guy L. Bond a few weeks before the December meeting so that he might make a composite of the individual reports. Further discussion on this very important matter was deferred to the December meeting.
6. No instructions in test procedures beyond the manual should be given.
7. The classroom teacher may administer the tests with the principal or some other professional person acting as the observer.
8. No administration of the outcome tests will be made prior to final testing except for one mid-year testing if that were called for in the research plan.
9. A pupil who moves from one experimental treatment to another during the year should be removed from the study.

10. At least in studies where in-service training of teachers is an essential aspect of the design, classes which have a change in teachers during the experimental year should be dropped.
11. The extent of active supervision for the improvement of instruction should be reported.

H. Recommendations concerning Statistical Analysis and Data Processing

Agreement was reached on a number of problems under discussion:

1. The Coordinating Center will be responsible for setting up the exact layout and order to be used in card punching. The work of the various committees at the conference will serve as a guide for the organization of the card.
2. Problems of data tabulation should be sent to the Coordinating Center for reviewal. All answers should then be sent to all projects to facilitate uniform tabulating procedures.
3. Some studies have instruments which are yet to be designed. If the factor to be measured is a common one, there should be discussion with the Coordinating Center on methods of recording scores.
4. Data should be punched on cards in terms of raw scores. Those projects wanting to use derived scores could use a conversion deck.
5. Probably scores on sub-tests, as well as the total test score, should be punched on the cards. Item tabulation should not be punched on the common data cards.
6. Data common to all studies, or to a cluster of studies, should be punched first on the card.
7. It might prove expedient to send two or three sets of cards -- at the beginning of the year with initial test data, at mid-year, and at the end of the year.
8. All raw data should be kept for some time, at least five years. This would make it possible to collect data not on cards at some later time.
9. Each project will process its own data. Duplicate cards or tapes should be made and sent to the Coordinating Center.
10. Card-punching should be kept as simple as possible in order to increase the likelihood of accurate recording of data.
11. If a project has not given a specified test, the column on the IBM card reserved for that variable should be left blank. Any other test of that same characteristic should be considered unique data and recorded elsewhere on the card.
12. Statistical consulting services and/or processing of data (for those projects desiring such assistance) can be arranged through the Coordinating Center.

13. Projects must determine whether the experimental unit is the classroom or the child. A statement of the randomization procedures should be made available to the Coordinating Center. It was agreed that in most cases the sampling unit would be the classroom.

IV. Summary

All present were enthusiastic about the conference. There was unanimous agreement on: (1) the need for common measures and procedures (the measures were selected and the experimental procedures decided upon); (2) the need for a coordinating center to furnish consultation service, inter-project analysis and interpretation of combined data, and to hold such meetings of project directors as is deemed necessary to the successful completion of the coordinating center's mission. The chairmen and the individual project directors felt that the conference was outstanding in its accomplishment and that the cooperation shown indicates that an unusual opportunity presents itself for the analysis of the combined data.